REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated May 22, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 22, 2008. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-34 are pending in the application. Claims 1-10 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 11-34 have been cancelled.

Further, Applicants are not conceding in this application that those amended (or canceled) claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the claimed subject matter. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these (pre-amended or canceled claims) and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Abbott et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,046,263, hereinafter "*Abbott*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

In this case, *Abbott* does not disclose "each and every element as set forth in the claim". For example, *Abbott* does not disclose "wherein at least some of the rules of the firewall ruleset each specify a different application type selected from a plurality of application types;" and "locating each rule in the firewall ruleset that includes a

parameter specifying the particular type of the requesting application; and determining whether the located rules are satisfied; whereby the rules are applied to each requesting application according to its respective application type." The Examiner argues that *Abbott* discloses these elements at 5:25-29; 15:51-57, 16:65 – 17:3; 19:2-6; 24:10-23 fig. 20A and fig. 23. However, the cited passages and figures are in fact directed to a description of attribute values which can have a variety of types of information related to them, and a security authorization scheme for accessing those attributes which is based solely on the identity of the requestor.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner takes the position that the "security authorization" found in *Abbott* (See, e.g. fig. 20A) corresponds to the claimed firewall ruleset. However, even assuming this were the case, *Abbott's* security authorization does not include a parameter specifying the particular type of the requesting application. In fact, the security authorization is not in any way related to the **application type**. Instead, the security authorization is based solely upon the **identity of the requestor**. See, for example, 8:53-54, "present private family information so that it is perceivable only to myself and my family members."

The Examiner further alleges that *Abbott* discloses attribute values that can have "a variety of types of information related to [them]," and that this related information "can be used… to determine whether and how to supply the values." Applicants respectfully disagree. While *Abbott* does teach associating different types of information with a given attribute value, these associations are not used as part of the security authorization which determines whether or not to allow access to those values. In fact, Figure 23 of *Abbott*, which shows such an association, is completely silent as to security authorization. Again, as stated above, security authorization in *Abbott* is based upon the identity of the requestor, and not upon any other "type of information" associated with a given value, much less the specific "type of information" claimed. That is, the security authorization is not based upon the particular application type requesting the value.

Therefore *Abbott* does not disclose, at least, the claimed features of "wherein at least some of the rules of the firewall ruleset each specify a different application type

selected from a plurality of application types;" and "locating each rule in the firewall ruleset that includes a parameter specifying the particular type of the requesting application; and determining whether the located rules are satisfied; whereby the rules are applied to each requesting application according to its respective application type."

Therefore, the claims are believed to be allowable, and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Gero McClellan, attorney of record, at (336) 643-3065, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)